Please reconsider the final rejection of this application in light of the following remarks:

First of all, Applicant notes that although the Examiner has rejected all of the claims on new grounds, only Claims 1 through 9 were amended. Accordingly, Applicant's amendments are not responsible for the new grounds for rejection of Claims 10 through 31 and the rejection of these claims should not have been made final.

Claims 1 through 31 are rejected as unpatentable over Sekizawa '711 in view of Mache '553. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Referring first to independent claims 1, 10, 17 and 20-22, as the Examiner has done, and first to exemplary independent claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Sekizawa does not disclose an application layer message document including a unique machine name and password combination in a hypertext format. The Examiner relies on Mache for this teaching. The proposed combination does not support the rejection. First of all, Mache is not in the same field of endeavor as Sekizawa. Sekizawa, like Applicant's invention, relates to the monitoring and control of machines connected to a server by a computer network. Mache, to the contrary, relates to a method and apparatus for reducing transaction costs associated with completing Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 Like Kind Exchange (LKE) transactions. The system and method described by Mache include no machines and in fact, as shown in Figure 1, the system facilitates transactions among human beings, or at least among stick figures, namely one or more exchangers, a consultant, and a qualified intermediary. While the like kind exchange processing system of Mache does use a computer network and extensible mark-up language/SOAP data

exchange, it is otherwise not the least bit similar to either Applicant's invention or to Sekizawa. The Examiner suggests that Mache discloses an application layer message document including a unique machine name and password combination in a hypertext format, referring to Section 280 for support. Applicant suggests that careful reading of Section 280 reveals that this is not the case. While Mache does mention a log-in password, which would presumably be entered by one of the consultant, exchangers, or qualified intermediaries, there is no mention of a unique machine name or even, strangely, any mention of a user identification for any of the consultant, exchanger, or qualified intermediary. Because Mache relates to transactions among people, it does not show or suggest using unique machine names nor is there any reason for believing that Mache would have any use for unique machine names because there are no machines. Moreover, there is no motivation to utilize even the log in password that is described by Mache in the system of Sekizawa. What conceivable relevance does a password used by an individual person have to a system for indicating the state of a plurality of network printers? Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in either Sekizawa or Mache provides any incentive for one skilled in the art to combine them, and that furthermore, even if they are combined, the unique machine name and password combination required by Claim 1 is not suggested. The rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 2, for purposes of this response, and without waiving the right to change its position later, Applicant does not presently rely on the limitation that the network is a TCP/IP network, but with respect to Claim 2

relies solely on the limitations in Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 2 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 3, Applicant does not presently rely on the wireless character of the network. The rejection of Claim 3 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 4, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner. Sekizawa quite clearly does not describe establishing a connection through a gateway device that provides protocol or address translation. Similarly, while it is conceivable that Mache might use such a gateway, there is no suggestion that he does and it is by no means clear that Mache would operate through a gateway device without modification. Applicant reminds the Examiner that it is the necessity for operating through a gateway device that provides protocol or address translation that was the impetus for Applicant's invention and the ability although not the necessity to operate through such a gateway is one of the advantages of Applicant's invention. To the extent that neither Sekizawa nor Mache mentions such a gateway device or any requirements associated with the use of such a gateway device, official notice is not warranted, and even if taken, there is nothing in either Sekizawa or Mache that would suggest that either one would work through such a gateway device without modification. The rejection of Claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner relies on Section 216 of Mache for disclosing memory in the central system for storing a unique machine name and password and information identifying the type of machine. Applicant disagrees. Mache is concerned with the tax consequences of a IRC Section 1031 like kind exchange transaction. The manufacturer make, serial number, and customer specific number referred to in paragraph 216 of Mache relate to the machine

being exchanged, not to any machine connected to the network as in Applicant's invention. While information about a machine being exchanged may be stored in Mache, no information about a remote machine connected to a central system by a network is stored and there is no suggestion for storing such information since, no machines are connected to a central system in Mache. The rejection of Claim 5 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 6-8, Applicant does not presently rely on the limitations of Claims 6-8 but instead relies on the limitations set forth in Claim 1 for the patentability of Claims 6-8.

Regarding Claim 9, the Examiner suggests that Mache shows a registration message that includes a non-unique identifier and in which the response from the server includes a unique identifier to be used by the asset in a subsequent message. Respectfully, Applicant disagrees. Careful reading of Mache, especially at Section 280, reveals that the registration message includes a log in password which presumably is unique rather than non-unique and that in response, the LKE broker returns the public key portion of a public/private key pair, which public key portion is by definition not unique. This can be seen readily from Figure 6 of Mache in which the exchange of information is shown graphically. Note that the broker sends its public key both to the exchanger and to the qualified intermediary. The public key is not unique as the Examiner suggests, because the same key is sent both to the exchanger and the qualified intermediary. Such a system would be ineffective in Applicant's invention because the machines being controlled must be uniquely identified. This isn't required in Mache which is only concerned with encrypting the messages said

between the exchangers, the qualified intermediary, and the LKE broker. The rejection of Claim 9 should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 10, the arguments made with respect to the patentability Claim 1 are incorporated. In addition, the Examiner suggests that storing a schedule and periodically activating the message generator according to the storage schedule are shown by Sekizawa. Even if this is true, what is missing from Sekizawa, and not suggested by Mache, is the additional limitation of Claim 10 of a receiver activated for a pre-determined time after the message generator is activated for receiving messages from the central system. The importance of this limitation can be better appreciated by recalling that Applicant's invention is designed to function when the machine is located behind the gateway that provides protocol or address translation. Such a gateway prevents the server from initiating a connection with the machine. Only the machine may initiate a connection and therefore the activation of a receiver for a pre-determined time after the message generator is activated, after the message generator has created the connection between the machine and the server, is necessary for the machine to receive messages from the central system using the connection. Nothing like this is shown or suggested by either Sekizawa or Mache.

Regarding Claims 11-16, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner attributes too much to the combination of Sekizawa and Mache when he states that providing a receiver for receiving an acknowledgment of a registration message and storing a token is a well known feature. Even if it is, which Applicant doesn't admit, there is nothing in either Sekizawa or Mache that

suggests using such a feature nor is there anything that suggests any benefit that might flow from such use.

Regarding Claims 17-31, Applicant incorporates the arguments already made in connection with Claims 1-16. The Examiner has not pointed out where in the references essentially any of the limitations of these claims can be found. To the extent that the Examiner relies on the same arguments as set forth in connection with Claims 1-16, those arguments have been addressed.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Neither Sekizawa nor Mache shows the combination of limitations making up Applicant's invention and moreover, there is no basis in either Sekizawa or Mache, nor anywhere else suggested by the Examiner for combining Sekizawa and Mache which are quite different types of systems.

Each of the matters raised in the Office Action having been addressed, reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

May 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Salai, Registration No. 26,990
HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 14604
Telephone: 585-232-6500
Fax: 585-232-2152